REMARKS

Claims 1-29 of the patent application were presented for examination. In the Office Action of June 7, 2007, claims 1-29 were rejected. The claims, as amended, are listed above. No new matter has been introduced to the claims. Claims 17-23 are canceled. Accordingly, claims 1-16 and 24-29 are now pending for examination.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the pending claims and respond to the Office Action as follows:

Objection to the Drawings

In paragraph 2 of the Office Action, Figure 2 was objected to for allegedly having no label in accordance with paragraphs 0035-0039 of the Specification. The subject drawing, as filed, is labeled "Figure_2" in the lower center portion of the sheet. Moreover, the cited paragraphs of the Specification do not relate to Figure 2. Applicants believe that this objection is an error requiring no amendment.

Rejections Under 35 USC § 101

In paragraph 3 of the Office Action, claims 1-16 were rejected as being directed to non-statutory subject matter because the term "subsystem" was considered as software per se. The amended claims no longer include the term, instead reciting the phrases "a local network device" and "one or more actuable controls."

Also, claims 21-23 and 27-29 are rejected as being directed to non-statutory subject matter because the phrase "computer readable medium" includes electromagnetic, infrared and propagated. However, each type of signal is associated with the computer-readable medium which is an object of manufacture. In particular, the specification states that a "computer-readable medium" may be an electromagnetic or infrared "apparatus, system, device

propagation medium, or computer memory" (para. 102). Each comprises statutory subject matter.

As a result, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

<u>Rejections Under 35 USC § 102(b)</u>

In paragraph 5 of the Office Action, claims 1-4, 6, 8-10, 17, 20, 21 and 24-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by US Patent Application No. 2003/0078965 submitted by Cocotis et al. ("Cocotis"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. In summary, while [insert summary of main argument].

Independent claim 1, as amended, is representative of independent claims 17, 20, 21 and 27. Claim 1 is directed towards a system for remote printing of network resources. The system comprises:

> a local network device to present one or more of the remote network resources responsive to a network query, the plurality of network resources capable of being printed in a tangible form and having an identifier; and

> one or more actuable controls associated with each of the one or more said remote network resources, the one or more actuable controls configured to initiate remote printing at a remote device responsive to communication of said identifier.

Advantageously, the system allows remote documents to be printed at a remote device.

In general, Cocotis discloses a system to manage outputs such as printing, faxing, and e-mail, over a computer network (Abstract). A user can locate a public output device using a query, and then select the output device to print source data (para. 201). Cocotis discloses a browser print component 337 to generate output image data (para 304). Thus, Cocotis discloses management of output devices for printing.

However, Cocotis fails to teach or suggest the invention as recited in claim 1. For example, claim 1 recites a "plurality of network resources capable of being printed in a tangible form" which are presented "responsive to a network query." The Office Action cites Cocotis for a "query for a list of available public devices" which are the output devices used to print a document (OA, p. 4; Cocotis, para 201). Because Cocotis is directed to a query for where to print data rather than a query for what is printed as is recited in claim 1, Cocotis fails to teach or suggest the network resources of claim 1.

Furthermore, claim 1 recites "one or more actuable controls associated with each of the one or more said remote network resources." In other words, one actuable control can be associated with one remote network resource while another actuable control can be associated with another remote network resource. In Cocotis, printing is initiated with a conventional browser print component that is built into a browser such as Internet Explorer by Microsoft. There appears to be only one component contemplated in Cocotis. Also, the component initiates a general print routine that is independent of a specific remote network resource. From a query, a user would have to browse to a specific network resource to initiate the general print routine. Thus, the browser print component of Cocotis fails to teach of suggest the actuable controls of claim 1.

Therefore, Applicants submit that independent claim 1, and related dependent claims, are patentable over Cocotis and the other prior art of record. Similarly, independent claims 17, 20, 21 and 27, and related dependent claims, are patentable for at least the same reasons as independent claim 1.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

In paragraph 21 of the Office Action, claims 5, 7, 11-16, 18, 19, 22 and 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cocotis, in view of US Patent Application No. 2003/0140315 submitted by Blumberg et al.

("Blumberg"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections. As discussed above, independent claim 1 is patentable over Cocotis. The rejected claims depend from independent claim 1 and similar independent claims. Blumberg, being generally directed towards a method for creating and viewing content to be printed, fails to cure the deficiencies of Cocotis. Therefore, dependent claims 5, 7, 11-16, 18, 19, 22 and 23 are patentable over the combination of Cocotis and Blumberg for at least the same reasons as the patentable independent claims.

Furthermore, claim 16 recites "each said remote network resource includes its processing cost proximate to its actuable control." Blumberg discloses pricing database software for determining a price (paras. 125-130). However, the pricing database software of Blumberg fails to contemplate including costs for one or more query results as in claim 16. Moreover, the prices are not proximate to an actuable control for a network resource. Therefore, claim 16 is patentable over the combination of Cocotis and Blumberg for at least this additional reason.

CONCLUSION

Applicants submit that Claims 1-16 and 24-29 are in condition for allowance. Should any unresolved issues remain, Examiner is invited to call Applicants' attorney at the telephone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

__November 26, 2007__
Date

/Joseph A. Sawyer, Jr./
Joseph A. Sawyer, Jr.
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 30,801

Customer Number 29141

Ph. (650) 493-4540
Fax. (650) 493-4549